



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,357	03/26/2004	Kristen W. Messina	MAEE 2 00065	1251
27885	7590	01/10/2005		EXAMINER
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SEVENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44114			SELLS, JAMES D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/810,357	MESSINA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James Sells	1734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 10, 15 and 16 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 5-9 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 2-4 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-7-04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Casaldi et al (US Patent 6,779,578).

Casaldi discloses a master processing apparatus or laminator. As shown in Figs. 1-10, the laminator comprises frame 24, master processing assembly 28 with upper and lower pressure applying portions 64 and 68, feed tray 96 and discharge structure or tray 100. Trays 96 and 100 are pivotally connected to the housing 24 and are movable from an operative lowered position to an inoperative raised position in the manner claimed by the applicant (see col. 7, lines 16-60).

Regarding claim 5, Fig. 4 of Casaldi shows the laminator with the housing sloping inwardly. In addition, trays 96 and 100 are in the raised position and are angled toward each other at distal ends in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casaldi et al as described above in paragraph 2 in view of Kerr et al (US Patent 6,640,866).

Kerr discloses a laminator assembly. As shown in Fig. 4, the laminator comprises first and second lamination rollers 120 and 130, heated by heating elements 180 and 190. These heated lamination rollers 120 and 130 apply heat and pressure to laminate materials together.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ heated pressure rollers, as taught by Kerr, in the laminator of Casaldi in order to facilitate laminating of the materials.

Regarding claim 8, it is the examiner's position that indicator lights and diffusers are well known and conventional in the art and would have been obvious to employ in the system of Casaldi in view of Kerr described above for safety reasons.

Regarding claim 9, it is the examiner's position that cord wraps are well known and conventional in the art and would have been obvious to employ in the system of Casaldi in view of Kerr described above to facilitate storage of the laminator when not in use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 should depend from claim 10 instead of from itself.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 10 and 15-16 are allowed.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 10, the prior art does not teach or make obvious the concept of inlet and outlet trays mounted to the housing and movable between a horizontal operative position and a storage position, at least one of the trays defining a handle by which the laminator can be transported when the trays are in the storage position in the manner claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claim 15, the prior art does not teach or make obvious the concept of raising the trays to a storage position, in which handles of the trays are located above the laminator housing for grasping by a user in the manner claimed by the applicant.

References

10. References C-G are cited as prior art of interest.

Telephone/Fax

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sells whose telephone number is (571) 272-1237. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 9:30 AM and 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Fiorilla can be reached at (571) 272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.



JAMES SELLS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 1700